AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q63460

Appln. No.: 09/803,738

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated February 22, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 remain pending the application. Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollstrom et al. (U.S.P. 6,763,247) in view of Miller et al. (U.S.P. 5,331,580). Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejections.

The present invention relates to a method and apparatus whereby a portable device having a display can output an image which is to be printed on its display. The display of the portable device can also serve as the operational interface of the printer. In this manner, the printer need not have its own display. This allows a constructions of a small, light and inexpensive printer structure.

Hollstrom relates to a cell phone which can remotely control several different external devices, such as a printer (Fig. 1, element 30), digital camera (5) or television set (40) and which can access the Internet. The communication between the cell phone and external devices can comprise a cable link (52) bluetooth (32) or infrared (42). The cell phone can interact with the digital camera to display an image transmitted by the camera to the phone and to subsequently send that image to an Internet. The cell phone may also perform maintenance on the camera,

-9-

such as deletion of images. With regard to the printer, the cell phone can remotely control the printer.

Miller relates to a data entry device that may be connected with a printer.

The Examiner concedes that the combination of Hollstrom and Miller fails to teach each feature of claim 1. The Examiner concedes that Hollstrom does not teach a direct physical connection between a portable device and printer, and cites Miller to make up for the deficiency. Applicant submits that the rejection is improper for at least the following two reasons.

First, contrary to the Examiner's contention, Hollstrom does not teach a display for displaying the image and also displaying print information for printing the image to work as the display device for the printer. The Examiner cites display 13 of the cell phone as the claimed display. While the cell phone of Hollstrom can display an image from the camera, there is no further teaching that the display 13 also displays the print information for printing the image (received from the camera). To the extent that the cell phone displays operations for the printer, Hollstrom does not further teach that the print information is for printing the displayed image. Rather, the remote control feature can relate to print of text data, not necessarily the displayed image. On the other hand, to the extent Hollstrom displays an image, there is no teaching that the image displayed can be sent to print data. The cell phone is disclosed as an intermediary between the camera and the Internet. However, there is no teaching that the cell phone operates in a similar manner between the printer and the camera. Therefore, vis a vis the printer, the cell

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q63460

Appln. No.: 09/803,738

phone of Hollstrom merely serves as a remote control but not necessarily a data source (image source).

Second it is noted that Hollstrom teaches remote control of several devices rather than local control of individual devices. Col. 1, lines 45-67. The Examiner contends that it would be obvious to include the direct physical connection of the printer in Miller to provide an alternative form of connection in Hollstrom. However, the Examiner appears to overlook the fact that Hollstrom already teaches multiple different forms of communicating, each as Bluetooth, infrared and cable. Moreover, because Hollstrom seeks to avoid the need for an individual local remote control, the reference does not teach or suggest creating local controls by physical connection of the cell phone and printer. The Examiner's second basis for direct connection of the portable device and printer, to provide a secure rest position for the portable device, is also not supportable. There is no inherent physical instability of the disclosed portable device.

Therefore claim 1 is patentable for at least the above reasons.

Because independent claims 6 and 13-15 include analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features of claim 1, claims 6 and 13-15 are also patentable for the reasons set forth above. The remaining claims are patentable based on their dependency.

With further regard to claim 13, this claim describes an instant print film as a print device. However, Hollstrom does not teach such a printer. Claim 10 is allowable for similar reasons.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q63460

Appln. No.: 09/803,738

With regard to claims 11-12, the Examiner contends that it is inherent in Hollstrom that the portable terminal is disposed inside the printer. Because Hollstrom teaches a Bluetooth wireless interface between the cell phone and printer, the physical insertion of structures is not inherent as the Examiner contends.

Claims 16-17 are added to describe the invention more particularly. The pocketable portable printer as described by claim 17 does not have sufficient space to have display and operation devices. Therefore display and operation device on the portable communication terminal side are combined as operation device for inputting the print information and display for displaying the print information.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Appln. No.: 09/803,738

Attorney Docket No.: Q63460

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE 23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 22, 2006